

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/606,417	06/26/2003	Arun V. Shastry	02280.003530	4883
5514 · 75 FITZPATRICK (90 04/18/2007 CELLA HARPER & S	CINTO	EXAM	INER ·
30 ROCKEFELL	30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA . FAISON GEE, VERON		ERONICA FAYE	
NEW YORK, NY	Y 10112		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
			1755	
			_	
SHORTENED STATUTORY I	PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
2 MONT	TUC .	04/18/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/606,417	SHASTRY ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Veronica Faison-Gee	1755	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence addr	ess
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this comr (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 Ma			
,	action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowan			nerits is
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4:	53 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			
4) Claim(s) 3-5,7,8,10-17,19,20,22,23,25,28-30,3.	3,34 and 37-41 is/are pending in	the application.	
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	vn from consideration.		
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6) Claim(s) <u>3-5,7,8,10-17,19,20,22,23,25,28-30,3.</u>	3,34 and 37-41 is/are rejected.		
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner	· f.		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce	epted or b) objected to by the I	Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the o	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	∋ 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti	on is required if the drawing(s) is ob	jected to. See 37 CFR	1.121(d).
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO	-152.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a))-(d) or (f).	
1. Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received.	•	•
2. Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received in Applicati	on No	
Copies of the certified copies of the prior	ity documents have been receive	ed in this National St	age
application from the International Bureau	(PCT Rule 17.2(a)).		
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	of the certified copies not receive	ed.	,
Attachment(s)			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary		
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P		
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:		

Application/Control Number: 10/606,417

Art Unit: 1755

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3-5, 7, 8, 10-17, 19, 20, 22, 23, 25, 28-30, 33, 34, and 37-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reitnauer et al (2003/0101902) in view of Kojima et al (US Patent 6,450,615).

Reitnauer et al teaches a method for forming a mark on a food product wherein the ink composition comprises a wax and colorant, and may further comprise a resin and antioxidant (abstract and page 1 para. 0011). The reference further teaches that the resolution of the mark can be at least 50 dpi and the food product may be an egg, cheese, fruit or a confectionary (page 1 para. 0008-0009). The wax may be selected from beeswax, candelilla wax, carnauba wax, polyethylene glycol and cocoa butter wherein the wax is present in the amount of 50 to 99 percent by weight (page 2 para. 0019-0020). The colorant may include a pigment or dye (page 2 para. 0025-0026), specifically FD&C Green no. 3, FD&C Blue no.1 and 2, FD&C Red no 40 and FD&C yellow no. 6 all of which are disclosed by Applicant specification in paragraph 0027. The ink composition may further comprise a stabilizer (page 2 para. 0027). The ink composition may include other conventional hot melt ink components, wherein the amount of the components may be included in the ink to provide the desired viscosity

Art Unit: 1755

(page 3 para. 0030). Reitnauer et al also teaches that the ink may be used in a conventional hot melt ink jet printer, piezoelectric printer (page 3 para. 0033-0034). Reitnauer et al fail to teach the specific printing method.

Kojima et al teaches a droplet ejection apparatus that may be used with various types of ink compositions (abstract). The reference further teaches that the printing apparatus has a resolution of 300 dpi or higher (col. 2 lines 39-50). The reference discloses that in general ink used for a droplet ejection apparatus has a viscosity of 8 to 15 cp in the case of a hot melt ink composition and the surface tension for any of the inks would be in the range between 10 and 70 dyne/cm (col. 3 lines 26-31).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the ink composition as taught by Reitnauer et al in the apparatus of Kojima, because Kojima apparatus may be used with hot melt ink compositions like that taught by Reitnauer et al.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 3-26-07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Reitnauer does not teach a water-soluble colorant into a fat or wax base using a carrier for the colorant. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. As shown above Reitnauer teaches the same water-soluble colorant as Applicant, even though these particular colorant are not used in an example does not make them less obvious to use as Reitnauer recites "the ink may include a colorant or dye, which provides color to the ink".

Application/Control Number: 10/606,417

Art Unit: 1755

Nonpreferred embodiments can be indicative of obviousness. *Merck & Co. v. Biocraft Laboratories Inc.* 10 USPQ 2d 1843 (Fed. Cir. 1989); *In re Lamberti* 192 USPQ 278 (CCPA 1976); *In re Kohler* 177 USPQ 399 (CCPA 1973); *In re Mills* 176 USPQ 196 (CCPA 1972); In re Bozek 163 USPQ 545 (CCPA 1969); *In re Meinhardt* 157 USPQ 270 (CCPA 1968); *In re Boe* 148 USPQ 507 (CCPA 1976); *In re Nehrenberg* 126 USPQ 383.

A reference is not limited to working examples. *In re Fracalossi* 215 USPQ 569 (CCPA 1982).

A reference is good not only for what it teaches by direct anticipation but also for what one of ordinary skill might reasonably infer from the teachings. *In re Opprecht* 12 USPQ 2d 1235, 1236 (Fed. Cir. 1989); *In re Bode* 193 USPQ 12 (CCPA 1976); *In re Lamberti* 192 USPQ 278 (CCPA 1976); *In re Bozek* 163 USPQ 545, 549 (CCPA 1969); *In re Preda* 159 USPQ 342 (CCPA 1968); *In re Van Mater* 144 USPQ 421 (CCPA 1965); *In re Jacoby* 135 USPQ 317 (CCPA 1962); *In re LeGrice* 133 USPQ 365 (CCPA 1962).

Applicant argues that Reitnauer does not teach using glycerin carrier for the colorant. However it is the position of the Examiner that once the components of the ink composition have been combined, including the glycerin, that the all the components are part of the carrier for the colorant.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Veronica Faison-Gee whose telephone number is 571-

Application/Control Number: 10/606,417 Page 5

Art Unit: 1755

272-1366. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday and alternate Fridays 8 am to 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jerry Lorengo can be reached on 571-272-1233. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

VFG 4-16-07

JAMORENGO